



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/923,268	08/02/2001	John Isaac Chandan Gomes	70006565-2	2549

7590 06/16/2005
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER	
ELAHEE, MD S	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2645	

DATE MAILED: 06/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/923,268

Applicant(s)

GOMES ET AL.

Examiner

Md S. Elahee

Art Unit

2645

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 March 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 9-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 9-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This action is responsive to an amendment filed on 03/29/05. Claims 1-7 and 9-20 are pending. Claim 8 has been cancelled.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7 and 9-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection which is deemed appropriate to address all of the needs at this time.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 3-7, 9, 10, 12-14, 17, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ortiz (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0058499) in view of Roeder (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0111176).

Regarding claim 1, Ortiz teaches transmitting a data (i.e., information) request from the wireless (i.e., mobile) device to the multimedia database resources (i.e., computer system) via a wireless network (i.e., first communication network) (fig.1; page 1, paragraph 0004, page 4, paragraph 0047, page 6, paragraphs 0055, 0058).

Ortiz further teaches generating a list of all available data as a first part of a response to the data request (fig. 1; page 4, paragraph 0047, page 6, paragraphs 0055, 0058). (Note; since, the user selects data for rendering, it is clear that the multimedia database resources inherently generate a list of all available data to the WD)

Ortiz further teaches transmitting the list of all available data from the multimedia database resources via the wireless network to the wireless device as a second part of the response to the data request (fig. 1; page 4, paragraph 0047, page 6, paragraphs 0055, 0058). (Note; since, the user selects data for rendering, it is clear that the multimedia database resources inherently transmit a list of all available data to the WD)

Ortiz further teaches selecting (i.e., designating) from the list of all available data a selected data to be processed and the data rendering device (DRD) (i.e., appliance) to which the selected data is to be applied as instructions in the wireless device (page 5, paragraph 0049, page 6, paragraphs 0055, 0058).

Ortiz further teaches transmitting the instructions from the wireless device to the multimedia database resources via the wireless network (fig. 1; page 5, paragraph 0049, page 6, paragraphs 0055, 0058).

Ortiz further teaches retrieving the selected (i.e., designated) data and applying the selected data to the DRD via a supporting network 12 (i.e., second communication network) for processing according to the instructions (fig. 1; page 4, paragraph 0047, page 5, paragraph 0049, page 6, paragraphs 0055, 0058).

Ortiz does not specifically teach that the first communication network includes a gateway with which the mobile device communicates by using standard telecommunication protocols, and the gateway converts the instructions to a format which the computer system understands.

Roeder teaches that the first communication network includes a gateway with which the mobile device communicates by using standard telecommunication protocols, and the gateway converts the instructions to a format which the computer system understands (fig.2; page 4, paragraph 0048, page 5, paragraphs 0052, 0056, page 6, paragraph 0059).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify Ortiz to incorporate a gateway with which the mobile device communicates by using standard telecommunication protocols, and the gateway converting the instructions to a format which the computer system understands such that gateway is supported to provide translation between two disparate networks.

Regarding claim 3, Ortiz teaches formatting (i.e., converting) the designated information to a formatted information suitable for the DRD by the computer system according to the instructions (page 2, paragraph 0009, page 4, paragraph 0047, page 6, paragraphs 0055, 0058).

Ortiz further teaches transmitting the formatted information from the computer system to the DRD via the second communication network according to the instructions (page 4, paragraph 0047, page 6, paragraphs 0055, 0058).

Ortiz further teaches applying the formatted information to the DRD for processing according to the instructions (page 4, paragraph 0047, page 6, paragraphs 0055, 0058).

Regarding claim 3, Ortiz teaches formatting (i.e., converting) the designated information to a formatted information suitable for the DRD by the computer system according to the instructions (page 2, paragraph 0009, page 4, paragraph 0047, page 6, paragraphs 0055, 0058).

Regarding claim 4, Ortiz teaches that a plurality of DRDs is connected to the computer system, the mobile device further designating the DRD among the plurality of DRDs in the instructions (page 5, paragraph 0049, page 6, paragraphs 0055, 0058).

Regarding claim 5, Ortiz teaches that the plurality of DRDs is registered in the computer system (page 5, paragraph 0049).

Regarding claim 6, Ortiz teaches that the mobile device designates the DRD by specifying the DRD identity in the instructions (page 5, paragraph 0049, page 6, paragraphs 0055, 0058).

Regarding claim 7, Ortiz teaches that the plurality of DRDs is connected to an DRD server as a remote part of the computer system, and wherein the DRD server converts the designated information to a formatted information suitable for the DRD (page 4, paragraph 0047).

Regarding claims 9 and 20, Ortiz teaches that the DRD is a printer, and the computer system converts the designated information to a print job in a format suitable for printing (page 4, paragraph 0046).

Regarding claims 10 and 19, Ortiz teaches that the computer system converts the designated information inherently to a PDL format suitable for printing (page 2, paragraph 0009, page 4, paragraphs 0046, 47, page 5, paragraph 0054, page 6, paragraphs 0058, 0059).

Regarding claim 12, Ortiz teaches that the computer system is only able to transmit the formatted information to the DRD if the DRD polls the computer system (page 4, paragraph 0047, page 5, paragraph 0054, page 6, paragraphs 0058, 0059).

Regarding claim 13, Ortiz teaches that the computer system transmits a message to the mobile device after applying the designated information to the DRD (page 6, paragraphs 0058, 0059).

Regarding claim 14, Ortiz teaches a first interface for receiving both information requests and instructions from the wireless (i.e., mobile) device via a wireless network (i.e., first communication network), wherein the instructions select (i.e., designate) the data (i.e., information) to be processed and the DRD (i.e., appliance) to which selected data is to be applied (fig.1; page 1, paragraph 0004, page 4, paragraph 0047, page 6, paragraphs 0055, 0058-0061, page 7, paragraph 0064). (Note; first interface is inherent)

Ortiz further teaches a second interface for sending the selected data to the DRD via a supporting network 12 (i.e., second communication network) (fig.1; page 4, paragraph 0047, page 6, paragraphs 0055, 0058). (Note; second interface is inherent)

Ortiz further teaches a server computer system connected to the first interface and the second interface, for processing and answering the data requests, for processing the instructions, and further for sending the selected data to the DRD for processing (fig.1; page 4, paragraph 0047, page 6, paragraphs 0055, 0058-0061, page 7, paragraph 0064).

Regarding claim 17, Ortiz teaches that the first communication network and the second communication network share a part of one common communication network (fig.1; page 4,

paragraph 0047). (Note; common communication network consists of network server 15 and HLR 16)

5. Claims 2, 11, 15, 16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ortiz (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0058499) in view of Roeder (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0111176) further in view of Levy (U.S. Patent 6,556,997).

Regarding claim 2 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Furthermore, Ortiz in view of Roeder does not specifically teach instructing via a third communication network a second sub-computer system to download all available information from the first sub-computer system to the second sub-computer system. However, Levy teaches instructing via a third communication network an information retrieval/scheduler unit 15 (i.e., second sub-computer system) to retrieve (i.e., download) all available information from the web information server 12 (i.e., first sub-computer system) to the information retrieval/scheduler unit 15 (fig.1; col.4, lines 42-57, col.5, lines 14-20, col.6, line 57-col.7, line 17).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify Ortiz in view of Roeder to instruct via a third communication network a second sub-computer system to download all available information from the first sub-computer system to the second sub-computer system in order to deliver the preferred information to the customer.

Ortiz in view of Roeder further does not specifically teach downloading all available information from the first sub-computer system to the second sub-computer system via a fourth communication network. However, Levy teaches retrieving (i.e., downloading) all available information from the web information server 12 (i.e., first sub-computer system) to the

information retrieval/scheduler unit 15 (i.e., second sub-computer system) via a fourth communication network (fig. 1; col.4, lines 42-57, col.5, lines 14-20, col.6, line 57-col.7, line 17).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify Ortiz in view of Roeder to download all available information from the first sub-computer system to the second sub-computer system via a fourth communication network in order to deliver the list of information from where the customer can make a choice.

Regarding claim 11, Ortiz in view of Roeder does not specifically teach that the second sub-computer system is only able to download all available information from the first sub-computer system if the first sub-computer system polls the second sub-computer system. However, Levy teaches that the information retrieval/scheduler unit 15 (i.e., second sub-computer system) is only able to retrieve (i.e., download) all available information from the web information server 12 (i.e., first sub-computer system) if the web information server 12 polls the information retrieval/scheduler unit 15 (fig. 1; col.4, lines 42-57, col.5, lines 8-20, col.6, line 57-col.7, line 17).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify Ortiz in view of Roeder to allow the second sub-computer system to download all available information from the first sub-computer system if the first sub-computer system polls the second sub-computer system in order to deliver the authorized services to the customer.

Regarding claim 15, Ortiz teaches that the data (i.e., information) is stored in a multimedia database resource (i.e., first sub-computer system), wherein the multimedia database resource is connected to the computer system, wherein the data requests select (i.e., designate)

Art Unit: 2645

the multimedia database resource (fig.1; page 4, paragraph 0047, page 6, paragraphs 0055, 0058).

However, Ortiz in view of Roeder does not specifically teach that a third interface connected to the server computer system for receiving the information sent from the first sub-computer system via a third communication network. However, Levy teaches a peeler server (i.e., third interface) connected to the proxy server 34 (i.e., server computer system) for receiving the information sent from the web server (i.e., first sub-computer system) via a third communication network (fig.1; col.4, lines 42-57, col.5, lines 8-20, col.6, line 57-col.7, line 17).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify Ortiz in view of Roeder to allow a third interface connected to the server computer system for receiving the information sent from the first sub-computer system via a third communication network in order to deliver the authorized services to the customer.

Regarding claim 16, Ortiz in view of Roeder does not specifically teach a fourth interface connected to the server computer system for sending the information received from the first sub-computer system to a second sub-computer system via a fourth communication network. However, Levy teaches a fourth interface connected to the proxy server 34 (i.e., server computer system) for sending the information received from the web information server 12 (i.e., first sub-computer system) to a information retrieval/scheduler unit 15 (i.e., second sub-computer system) via a fourth communication network (fig.1; col.4, lines 42-57, col.5, lines 8-20, col.6, line 57-col.7, line 17).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify Ortiz in view of Roeder to allow a fourth interface connected to the server computer

Art Unit: 2645

system for sending the information received from the first sub-computer system to a second sub-computer system via a fourth communication network in order to deliver the authorized services to the customer based on the customer preference.

Regarding claim 18 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 17.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Md S. Elahee whose telephone number is (571) 272-7536. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon to Fri from 8:30am to 5:00pm.

Art Unit: 2645


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang can be reached on (571) 272-7547. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

M.E.

MD SHAFTUL ALAM ELAHEE

June 12, 2005


FAN TSANG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600